



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,264	07/27/2001	Colin P. Britton	0103488-00003	7813
21125	7590	10/07/2003	EXAMINER	
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2175	14	
DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 11

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

COPY MAILED

OCT 07 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Colin P. Britton, et al.
Application No. 09/917,264
Filed: July 27, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 0103488-00003

DECISION GRANTING PETITION
UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)

This is a decision on the petition, filed September 2, 2003, which is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the instant nonprovisional application for failure to timely notify the U.S. Patent and Trademark (USPTO) of the filing of an application in a foreign country, or under a multinational treaty that requires publication of applications eighteen months after filing. *See* 37 CFR 1.137(f).

The petition is **GRANTED**.

Petitioner states that the instant nonprovisional application is the subject of an application filed in an eighteen month publication country on May 15, 2002. However, the USPTO was unintentionally not notified of this filing within 45 days subsequent to the filing of the subject application in an eighteen month publication country. Petitioner explains that it was believed that the filing of a "PCT Request" with the USPTO United States Receiving Office fully met their obligation under 35 U.S.C. 112(b)(2)(B)(iii) to notify the USPTO of the foreign or international filing of such invention."

37 CFR 1.213(c) requires the applicant to provide notice, and 37 CFR 1.4(b) provides that each application must be complete in itself. An international application would not be placed into the file of an application that it relies upon for the benefit of an earlier filing date, and so applicant was required to file a separate paper pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4(b) in the above-identified application. Therefore, the mere filing of a PCT application is not the notification required by 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) and 37 CFR 1.213(c). Petitioner's attention is also directed to 37 CFR 1.4(c), which states:

Since different matters may be considered by different branches or sections of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, each distinct subject, inquiry or order must be contained in a separate paper to avoid confusion and delay in answering papers dealing with different subjects.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4(c), the separate paper was required to address a distinct subject. Therefore, since a notification of foreign filing was required to be on a separate paper, the filing of the PCT application did not serve as the notification of foreign filing required by 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii). It should be noted that the USPTO acts in a distinctly separate capacity, and in

a dedicated, separate part of the Office, when it acts as a Receiving Office for the filing of applications and papers under the PCT. Accordingly, as a review of the contents of the file of the above-identified application shows that no notification of the May 15, 2002 filing of the PCT application was filed within 45 days after the filing date of the PCT application, applicants' failure to provide such timely notice of the filing of the PCT application, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) and 37 CFR 1.213(c), caused the above-identified application to become abandoned by operation of law after midnight June 29, 2002.

A petition to revive an application abandoned pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) for failure to notify the USPTO of a foreign filing must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply which is met by the notification of such filing in a foreign country or under a multinational treaty;
- (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date of the reply until the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional.

The instant petition has been found to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.137(b). Accordingly, the failure to timely notify the USPTO of a foreign or international filing within 45 days after the date of filing of such foreign or international application as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) and 37 CFR 1.213(c) is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

There is no indication that a reply to the non-final Office action of June 18, 2003 has been filed. Accordingly, a shortened statutory period of three (3) months for reply to the non-final Office action of June 18, 2003 is restarted with the mailing date of this decision. Extensions of time pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. Failure to timely reply within the period restarted by this decision will result in the abandonment of this application.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Sherry D. Brinkley at (703) 305-9220.

This application is being returned to Technology Center Art Unit 2175 to await a reply to the non-final Office action mailed June 18, 2003, the period of which is restarted to run from the mailing date of this decision on petition as noted above.


Sherry D. Brinkley
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

Conferee: Frances M. Hicks
Lead Petitions Examiner
